# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*

Senator Borah and Professor Beard on Foreign Policy - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

The Mastery of Human Fate - *George E. O'Dell*

Marxism and Religion - - *A. Stiernotte*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 8

Chicago, June 20, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice* — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*



*Board of Directors*

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

*Editorial Contributors*

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

*Poetry Editors*

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

*Washington Correspondent*

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

*Foreign Representatives*

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN, FRED HANKINSON, REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL, ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH


## *Contents*


EDITORIAL—
Notes ..... 115
Jottings—J. H. H. ..... 117
ARTICLES—
Senator Borah and Professor Beard on Foreign Policy—BRENT DOW ALLINSON ..... 118
The Mastery of Human Fate—GEORGE E. O'DELL ..... 121
Marxism and Religion—A. STIERNOTTE ..... 123
POETRY—
The Jobless—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER ..... 124
THE STUDY TABLE—
A New Proclamation of the Christian Gospel—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ..... 125
Interpreting the Orient—Taraknath Das ..... 125
CORRESPONDENCE—
The Marcus Graham Case—I—MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE ..... 127
The Marcus Graham Case—II—LEON R. YANKWICH ..... 127
Evolution and Henry Ward Beecher—CHARLES LYTTLE ..... 127
Women in the War Parade—V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK ..... 127
The Darrow Number— I—MORRIS LYCHENHEIM ..... 127
II—SYDNEY STRONG ..... 127
Fifth Avenue Poster Walk Attracts Thousands—A. J. MUSTE ..... 127
THE FIELD—
Heroes of Peace ..... 114
Unity—ROMAIN ROLLAND ..... 128
How to Make Peace—*Nofrontier News Service* ..... 128


## The Field

***"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."***

### Heroes of Peace

For the sixteenth successive year, in Cincinnati, Ohio, services were held on Memorial Day and graves decorated in tribute to humble men and women who had died as bravely in peace as soldiers in war. The heroes thus commemorated this year were a common laborer, a railroad worker, a fireman, a policeman, and a mother—all dead in the line of duty. The following address on this occasion was delivered by Hon. Edmund D. Doyle, representative in the Ohio Legislature:

About a year ago I happened to glance out of the office window. Across the street there was a veritable beehive of human activity. Large steel girders were being hoisted from the ground below and deftly and accurately maneuvered into a position which had been calculated to the last fraction of an inch by mechanical engineers toiling over their drawing boards some six months before.

The air was filled with the strident music of a modern construction project. While cables creaked and groaned under the strain of their ponderous load, the power machinery whirred its song of man's emancipation from back-breaking labor, all to the accompaniment of the staccato machine-gun melody of the air hammers.

Hundreds of feet above the ground men were delicately balancing themselves on narrow girders with all the nonchalance of Sunday afternoon strollers along the boulevard. Some of the more daring were riding the girders into place, twisting, and revolving in giddy fashion on their mounts of steel.

The framework of a new and impressive temple of commerce was rearing its lofty head against the sky. Below other men walked on the safe, firm ground absorbed in the details of their own lives, paying scant heed to the epic drama being enacted overhead.

Suddenly above the roar of the machinery, above the groan of the cables and the din of the air hammers pounding the rivets, there came a piercing cry—a cry of agony and futility. The eyes of the pedestrians turned upward in unison and there in stark terror they beheld a human form hurtling through the air to its death couch of concrete below.

Now there stands as a monument to that unknown soldier of peace an imposing edifice of granite, wood, and steel. True, the name of the anonymous hero is not inscribed in lasting marble over the entrance to the building; at the dedication ceremonies not even a word of eulogy was pronounced in his honor.

But today in the hushed silence of this beautiful and secluded spot removed from the clamor of the commercial world, which our heroes have builded, we pay an insignificant but richly deserved tribute to that construction worker, who sacrificed his life that you and I might have shelter,

(*Continued on page* 128)

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXXI MONDAY, JUNE 20, 1938 No. 8

### SWORD AND SICKLE

**The sword hung on the barren heath,**
**The sickle in the fruitful field;**
**The sword he sung a song of death,**
**But could not make the sickle yield.**

*William Blake.*

---

### NEWS FROM GANDHI

A copyrighted dispatch from India, published in the New York *Times* through the North American Newspaper Alliance, Inc., brings good news from Gandhi. His health is excellent. "I am better now than I have been for a long time." He has recently been on an extended trip through the troublous northwest provinces of the country, where he was everywhere received in triumph. The tour was like one of his old campaigns when whole countrysides turned out to see and hear him. Gandhi is convinced that political conditions are much more favorable for India than they have been for a long time past. "Many discordant factors have disappeared," he states, "and the whole outlook for India's cause is now much more encouraging." Certain of the Indian leaders are talking about dominion status in five years, but "I see the independence of India," says Gandhi, "in another two or three years." The Mahatma's latest achievement has been the leadership of a Hindu-Moslem conference at Bombay, where he was interviewed by the correspondent. Dissension between these two great religions, Mohammedanism and Hinduism, has long been one of India's greatest weaknesses and one of Gandhi's greatest concerns. Now he believes that the two religions "will at last settle their differences amicably and come to a sound working agreement for political coöperation. Such unity will mean that we have passed one of the most significant milestones in the cause of Indian independence." The patience of Gandhi is inexhaustible. For years he has been working on this Hindu-Moslem question, knowing full well that there can be no independence for his country until his countrymen can prove their ability to dwell together in harmony. In the same way, and through the same weary years, he has toiled for the emancipation of the untouchables, knowing full well again that Indians cannot demand their own freedom until they have first granted freedom to their repressed classes. Now does victory approach in both these fields. The redemption of India within is the guaranty of her liberty without. The world's greatest statesman and noblest saint already sees the reaping of his sowing.

### THE UNSUCCESS OF WAR

War doesn't seem to be prospering much these days. Something's wrong! Here Franco has been fighting for two years in Spain. He has conquered territory, won battles, slaughtered innumerable women and children and non-combatants generally, enjoyed consistently an immense preponderance in troops, weapons, munitions, and yet he doesn't get anywhere. Even his high-sounding title of "Generalissimo" seems to have no magic in it. What's the matter? The same thing is true also in China. The Japanese went into that disorganized, primitive, poverty-stricken country with the first-class machinery of modern war, and expected to clean up in a few weeks. They would break off another large slice of territory, to add to Manchuria in the north, and thus have a wide empire under their rule for exploitation. But things haven't worked out that way at all. Against the untrained and ill-equipped masses of the Chinese, the superb armies of Japan make progress to be sure, but the progress doesn't mean anything in terms of victory. The Japanese have grand success in devastating and depopulating territory; they have driven millions of helpless people to exile and starvation; they bomb and burn cities with horrifying results. But the war doesn't end. The farther the Mikado's armies advance, the worse they bog down in China's wastes. In August it will be a year since the fighting started. How long can Japan keep it up? This war business, in other words, isn't exactly what it's cracked up to be. We are reading amazing statements to the effect that the modern mechanization of war is breaking down of its own weight. Bad weather, bad roads, lack of communications, failure of supplies, any one of a hundred things will stall in its tracks the vast enginery which constitutes a modern army. And the expense of maintenance is beyond all calculation. Which means that war is outdoing and thus undoing itself! And this may be the real reason.

dear reader, why war does not come in Europe! Crisis after crisis appears—and passes; and still the dreaded cataclysm is postponed. Is it that the nations do not dare to fight? That they are afraid of their own machines?

### PURGES

We don't like purges. They seem to us disgusting wherever they appear. When Mussolini carried on his purges in the early years of Fascism, and Hitler had his great purge all in one day (June 30, 1934), we were horrified—not because Mussolini and Hitler were responsible, but because the purge business itself outraged our every sense of decency and fair play. We felt the same way when Stalin began his purging. We have always been sympathetic with Soviet Russia, and are today; but the purges turned our stomach and made us detest the party and government guilty of such offense. Now the purge has come to America—and we feel the same way again. Of course, our purge is different—it has no violence—but it is the same in spirit and in purpose. For purges may be "hot" or "cold," they may be "wet" or "dry," they may be direct and bloody or indirect and political. But in method and aim, whatever the difference in character of performance, there is always the same process at work—a deliberate getting rid of enemies or opponents by the use of governmental or personal power. This is what Mr. Roosevelt is now attempting in his plan to drive from office, and therefore both from the Democratic Party and Washington, all senators and representatives who have to any degree or in any way refused to support the New Deal. It seemed at first incredible that the President could even contemplate this idea of purging both party and government of those who have not obeyed every slightest nod from the White House. Surely opposition is of the very essence of democracy! But after what has happened in Pennsylvania and Florida and Oregon and Iowa and Maryland, we know that the idea has not only been considered but actually adopted. The purge is under way—none but 100 per cent Roosevelt Democrats are to be left in office—and the $4,000,000,000 "pump-priming" bill is the weapon to be used. "Thus is exposed to the view of the whole people," writes Arthur Krock, leading Washington correspondent, Pulitzer Prize winner in journalism, advocate of the New Deal on many an occasion, "one of the ugliest, most menacing political drives in this country's history."

### ARTHUR E. MORGAN AND THE OLD MORALITY

It is not at all difficult to see where the issue lies in the TVA case as between Arthur E. Morgan, the ousted chairman of the Board, and his two fellow-members, Harcourt A. Morgan and David Lillienthal. Now that these three men have each testified before the Congressional Committee of Inquiry, the whole story becomes as clear as daylight. It may all be summed up in terms of the old controversy between ends and means. Dr. Morgan, the ex-Chairman, is as devoted to the TVA and all it stands for as either or both of his former colleagues. He believes in the government's development of public power for the uses of the people. He is opposed to the traditional exploitation of the people by private utility companies, and would put these companies out of business. But it happens also that Dr. Morgan is a man with a conscience, in the old-fashioned sense of the word. He believes that a good end should be advanced by means equally good—i. e., that, in advancing the public interest, no wrong should be done to any private individual. Dr. Morgan, in addition to being a great engineer, is also a gentleman, and holds therefore to certain laws of decency in human relationships, even as between government and private business corporations. Dr. Morgan, in other words, in the administration of the TVA set his face like flint against using unrighteous means for securing the righteous ends of public ownership and operation of natural power resources, and was willing to suffer delay and perhaps even defeat for the time being as the price of honor. His partners, on the other hand, had no such scruples. They were ready to use any means, however disreputable, for the accomplishment of their great ends. Like the President, who stated his ethical doctrine in a famous speech in September last, they were interested in "objectives," and were not concerned with the ways and means of reaching these objectives. These two men, in the other words, were thoroughly in accord with the Washington doctrine that anything is justified so long as it helps one to achieve his end. Dr. Morgan, a true moralist, refused to play along with such a game. Alone, and at the cost of position, income and public repute, he challenged the administration on straight ethical grounds. We shall know the state of the nation when we see how the people react to this appeal.

### AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

The recent convention of Communists in New York offers occasion for comment. We take advantage of this occasion herewith! For Communism as a political and economic philosophy we have profound respect, though it is in many aspects not our own philosophy. Communism represents a concrete doctrine of life, based on certain historical and psychological generalizations, and thought through to certain definite conclusions as to individual conduct and social reform. The product of an outstanding intellectual genius, Karl Marx, it must stand, whatever its truth or error, as one of the supreme projections of human thought. For Communists also, as a group, we have respect. Many of them, perhaps most of them, are sincere, devoted, hard-working, courageous, and are making extraordinary sacrifices for their cause. They should be given

every legitimate opportunity to advance this cause. But for the Communist Party, especially the American branch thereof, we have nothing but contempt—a contempt the more bitter since we know how little the rank and file members have to do with its activities. The Communist Party in this country is hypocrisy incarnate. It is dishonest in every nerve and fibre of its organization. Knowing that it has not one chance in a million of persuading the American people to accept Communism, the Party deliberately undertakes to deceive the people and thus to mislead them in its own interest. Thus, as in this recent New York convention, the Party made a great to-do about democracy and civil rights, when, as a matter of fact, it no more believes in, nor would itself practise, democratic freedom than Hitler in Germany—or Stalin in Russia. The Party is all for Roosevelt and the New Deal, not because it cares a fig about a President working desperately to save and reform the existing industrial system, but only because it welcomes a cloak of respectability behind which to hide its own devious machinations. The Party wants peace, so it says, and offers a program of "collective security" on behalf of peace, whereas its only purpose is so to entangle this country in the European confusion as to make it inevitable that America will be fighting in the next war on the side of Russia, and thus insuring victory for Russia, as for the Allies in the last war, at its own unrequited expense. The Communists are the modern Jesuits. Communism as little as Christianity can be served by dishonesty of this disgusting type.

### THEY SATISFY!

Now and again, amid the tragedies of this terrific age, there come events which bring satisfaction and peace, even uplift, to the soul. For example, there is this recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the matter of the right of the federal government to lay a ten per cent admission tax on tickets to football games promoted by state universities. The Court decided that the government could impose this tax since the football games in question were to be regarded as business conducted for profit! If that isn't balm to our soul, what could be? For years we have argued in these columns, and elsewhere, that college football is nothing in the world but a professional commercial undertaking, with profits and advertising taking completely the place of sport. The Supreme Court agrees! These football games are "a business comparable in all essentials to those usually conducted by private owners." Another infinitely comforting event is the arrest of "Jimmie" Hines, Tammany district leader in New York. "Jimmie" has for years been one of the most potent politicians in the metropolis. Now the new District Attorney, Mr. Dewey, has indicted him as the "higher-up" man in one of the most notorious of the rackets in the great city. For years it has been the custom, when public clamor has been sufficiently loud, to seize a few of the "little fellows" engaged in vice and crime, and put them behind the bars. But these "little fellows" have always operated under the direction of the "big shots" in politics who themselves have never been touched. Now Mr. Dewey has laid hands upon the biggest of them all. Hurrah! A third satisfying event is the renewed appeal of the Home Secretary in England for air-raid precaution volunteers in case of war. The first appeal was an abyssmal failure, even in the face of recurring war scares. It is enormously encouraging thus to learn that England's millions are immune to the war mania, and will not play the game of government warmongers. They satisfy — such events as these! The world is not all gone to the dogs yet.

---

# Jottings

Japanese soldiers are taking "energy tablets" and inhaling oxygen in the Chinese war. This is science's latest contribution to the art of sustaining armies in the field. The need of the Japanese soldiers for invigoration of this type is manifest in every dispatch from the battle front in China.

---

The Unitarian Ministerial Union is seeking to insure pensions to ministers which will be at least as high as pensions given policemen. Isn't this a rather extravagantly high mark at which to aim?

---

A Canadian scientist has discovered that the human jaw is growing smaller. This may be so—but it's not for lack of exercise. Talking was never so abundant, nor gum-chewing so prevalent.

---

A judge in New York who threatened to clear his courtroom of a noisy and ill-behaved crowd of onlookers, *actually cleared it!* Good heavens, what does this mean? Perhaps that some day a president, or governor, or mayor, or congressman, who promises in his electoral campaign to economize, *will economize.*

---

And so, farewell for another summer! "Jottings," sadly weary and in need of a vacation, will resume its maunderings in the issue of October 3rd next.

J. H. H.

# Senator Borah and Professor Beard on Foreign Policy

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

It seldom happens that an active statesman and a distinguished historian meet face to face in time of an international crisis to consider the dangers that confront their country, and to take counsel together concerning the march of nations and of public policy-in-the-making. Generally, the historian does not appear until the statesman is dead, and the victims of his illusions, blunders, and wars are laid out in trenches or in graves, when he comes prowling over the No Man's Land of History searching among the ruins of empires, kingdoms and republics, dictators, monarchs and presidents for the causes of the behavior that brought them low! It happens still more rarely that a journalist is privileged to record the ebb and flow of ideas of statesman and historian before the events which have evoked them have become irrevocable history.

Recently, however, while newspaper headlines were screaming abroad the onrush of tragic events in Europe and Asia, and proclaiming the advent of an unlimited armament race among the Great Powers, with the scrapping of all sane treaty limitations upon their military and naval armaments, Senator William E. Borah held a conference* in his office at the Capitol with the ruddy, Roman-nosed, silver-haired, and bright-eyed dean of American historiographers, Prof. Charles Austin Beard, former president of the American Historical Association, and author of a dozen books known to two generations of college students and others. (Author, in particular, of two vivid essays of historical interpretation: "The Economic Basis of Politics" and "Our Navy: Defense or Portent"—which predict the course of future events from principles deduced from a cogent analysis of the past, and warn against the dangers to democracy of vested private interests and of growing militarism and navalism, in Germany, England and America.) The historian and the man who for more than twenty years has been a leading figure of the American Senate and its important Foreign Relations Committee—serving the nation and three successive Republican administrations as its chairman for twelve years—had met to discuss the war-crisis in Asia and Europe, the alleged threats to democracy abroad, and the direction of American foreign policy in face of the gathering dangers beyond the eastern and western horizons. They had met, in particular, to discuss the participation of the United States in the world naval race, which played so fateful a part in the precipitation of the World War of 1914-1918, and to consider the obscure forces — the ideas and economic interests—that are endeavoring to mould contemporary American foreign policy (and naval-building policy) in a direction wholly different from that laid down by successive acts of Congress, and sustained by emphatically expressed public opinion throughout the nation.

"Senator," said the tall and kindly professor on entering the spacious inner office, "having looked to you for many years for fearless utterance against many illusions and many efforts to entangle the American people in the political intrigues and imperialist plans of European Powers, I want to commend heartily your recent public statement in which you denounced this suicidal armament race and opposed our participation in it. Your demand for fearless efforts to save democracy by constructive attacks upon unemployment and the problem of monopoly at home, is sane. And I heartily agree with you in opposing the President's dangerous proposal now pending in Congress that would authorize a vast and costly, unnecessary and even provocative expansion of our navy and warship construction program. I refer to the Vinson Bill and its authorization of twenty-six or more new warships which are as unnecessary for the national defense, in view of already existing large authorizations, as is the proposal for universal industrial and human conscription, in the so-called May Bill, approved by the War Department."

"Thank you," replied Senator Borah quietly. "I appreciate your commendation, and am glad to have an expression of your views of the matter. Nothing more dangerous has come before the Congress in many years. While most of the newspapers of the country appear to be supporting the plan for nearly doubling the strength and size of the Navy, at whatever cost, my private correspondence indicates that the people are overwhelmingly against these proposals. If they are approved by the Congress, they will certainly produce misunderstanding and retaliatory naval-building on the part of the jingoes and militarists of Japan, while threatening our democracy at home. Indeed, they are already producing it. I believe that nothing whatever should be done by our Government to intensify this killing race for destructive international armament —or be left undone to combat it. War and democracy are incompatible institutions."

"Not only is the present great naval and military establishment amply sufficient for the needs of our continental defense," continued Professor Beard, "but any enlargement of it is certain to be misconstrued, as it has been in the past. It will increase international tension instead of lessening it, and provoke further building on the part of Japan, in 'self-defense' against us. It is a kind of fatal circle of fear and destruction—if not a gigantic international racket—that we are asked to enter. You have observed that the Prime Minister of Japan declared officially to the Diet, only the other day, that—speaking for Japan—he was prepared to abolish the battleship entirely, if other nations would do likewise. To that the President has made no reply. How do you think our silence in this serious matter will be interpreted in the Oriental world?"

"Not only by the Oriental world!" exclaimed the Senator, with conviction. "The entire world, looking on this naval agitation and expansion of ours, and noting recent statements by certain British leaders, is already convinced that there is a working agreement between the United States and

*This conference occurred during the Congressional consideration of the Vinson Bill.—*Editor.*

Great Britain for the mastery of all the oceans and of the world's trade."

"I observed with interest," rejoined the Professor dryly, "that Sir Anthony Eden is reported to have said, cryptically, to the House of Commons, in one of his last speeches as foreign minister, that there is a very good understanding with the United States Government, affecting naval policy as well as foreign policy in general, the terms of which he could not reveal."

"And I was equally interested to note," said the Senator, "that the Hon. Winston Churchill, sometime First Lord of the Admiralty, who has the merit of unwonted frankness of speech for a Briton, stated recently that there was an 'excellent arrangement' with the United States. What is that 'arrangement,' can you tell me Professor?"

"The Secretary of State," replied Dr. Beard, "has informed you officially, I understand, that there is no such arrangement—nor even any technical understanding with Great Britain or the British Navy. Yet he indicates that our policy is developing on 'parallel lines of independent action' if we may know what that means."

"Of course, we must believe the Secretary," said Senator Borah. "Whatever the newspapers may say about the activities of our admirals, neither the Senate nor the country knows of any such arrangement or understanding—if one exists—and just as certainly both would emphatically disapprove it, if it were to be openly proposed or tacitly consummated. The American people are not yet prepared, and will not agree, to underwrite the far-flung holdings of the British Empire, by diplomacy or force. . . . We must accept the statement of the Secretary of State. *But sometimes what amounts to an 'understanding' springs up as a result of independent national action.* I cannot forget that another Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Grey, and the premier, Mr. Asquith, informed Parliament repeatedly in the summer of 1914 that Britain was in no way bound by any alliance or understanding with France. About the 4th of August of that year, however, they—the people—discovered, too late, that they were, in fact, bound by national 'honor' and by nameless naval and military 'understandings'; that they were 'tied to France in the dark,' as Lloyd George once expressed it. And they 'slipped and stumbled' into the terrible World War, despite their proclaimed good intentions to avoid it. This was largely because of secret diplomacy and the understandings of technical representatives of the armed services, of which Parliament knew nothing. I hope that we are not now moving in the same direction."

"Those events must never be forgotten," nodded the Professor gravely. "I may tell you that some of my acquaintances who are in close touch with technical experts of the Navy have informed me that we have built, or are building, in some respects, only *half* a navy, for offensive purposes; and that the British possess the other half. The reference, of course, is to naval bases and coaling stations around the world, especially in the Orient, without which any navy is helpless. Political assurances by cabinet ministers for parliamentary consumption mean little, and have frequently been misleading in modern history. The present situation is as dangerous as it is obscure. What can be done about it, Mr. Borah?"

"It is difficult to get all of the exact facts," replied the Senator. "Our efforts in that direction here in the Senate are met by general denials. We have endeavored to define certain basic national policies, in Congress, looking towards honest neutrality and non-intervention in foreign wars. Such efforts have not been seconded in Europe. If one is going to restrain arms-merchants from supplying belligerents, obviously, to be effective, the undertaking must be a joint one, and must be loyally enforced by more than one government. And the policy must be courageously developed and wielded by the President, in accordance with changing circumstances and agreements."

"The Senate," said Professor Beard firmly, "possesses under our Constitution a coördinate authority with the President's, in the matter of the basic direction of foreign policy. It was intended by the Founders, as a result of long experience and reflection, to serve as a Federal Executive Council —to give its advice, as well as its consent, to the conclusion of treaties with foreign governments, and to the appointment of all our ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls, who are to serve as the agents—the eyes and ears and hands and feet—of American foreign policy. The Constitution does not confide the direction and control of American foreign policy, even by implication, to the President and his State Department alone. Any supposition that it does has no foundation in the Constitution. It is, therefore, preposterous to permit the foreign policy of this democracy to be formulated in the dark, by the Navy or for the Navy, or even by the President and the Department of State, without obtaining the prior advice and consent of the Senate, and without informing the Congress and the country of the ends in view and of any major changes in direction or understanding. You may recall"—and here the Professor drew a paper from his pocket—"that in the time of the first Roosevelt, when the President ordered the marines to seize and hold the island republic of San Domingo, without the consent of Congress or any declaration of war by it, the Senate then rejected an agreement made by one of our admirals with San Domingo, submitted by the President, and passed a ringing resolution, which read as follows:

> The people's power of self-protection is silently passing from the hands of their representatives into the sole and exclusive power of the President. . . This fatal door, through which the rightful powers of the Senate will pass into the hands of the Executive, should be closed, so that a mere diplomatic agreement concluded by the President cannot bind the Government of the United States, and all the States and people. . . Our Government will become a true autocracy when the President is invested with this power.

You may remember, also, that Madison himself wrote: 'The power of treaty-making' (that is, of pledging the policy or faith of the nation) 'is regarded by the Constitution as having more affinity to the legislative than to the executive character. . .' It is useful to recall such facts as these."

"If we should inquire further into the making of American foreign policy now," said the Senator, "I fear that we should elicit very little further infor-

mation about it. How can we get the facts, before it is too late?"

"Surely, the Congress and the country are not helpless!" exclaimed the historian. "Woodrow Wilson found his Versailles policy completely repudiated by the country, at the end of his second term. That can happen again. The people do not want our diplomats to meddle in far-flung imperialist adventures, or make political commitments, even by implication. Surely, these things can be stopped by Congress, if necessary by legislation. It created the Department of State, by an act, and by another one it can abolish it—or require the Secretary to report fully and directly to it, rather than to the President. That would, of course, be an extreme measure. But other things can be done less extreme than that to ensure a more democratic control of foreign and naval policy, which the Constitution plainly intended to accomplish. Secret manipulation of foreign policy, the exercise of power-diplomacy and intimidation are attributes of monarchy and dictatorship, not of genuine republicanism and democracy."

"It is possible that we can do something more, by legislation," said the Senator. "But all that we do will be negatived, I fear, unless we can have the active coöperation of the Executive, especially in foreign policy. In the matter of neutrality, and of arms-embargoes, this is plainly the case."

"The authorization of this super-navy," continued the Professor, "is a gesture of much importance in the field of foreign policy—a gesture likely to be misinterpreted by others—and it lies wholly within Congressional control. What are we doing it for? What does it really mean? What purposes does it conceal? We are entitled to know. It is absolutely essential that we should know what we are doing, and that we should not engage—as Germany engaged before the War, and Italy since—in a policy of bluster and threat. It will be of great public service to declare what we mean to defend,—to exclude the Philippines, if we have no intention of defending them, as Congress has declared already, and to make our pacific intentions unmistakably clear, before any increases of naval armament are authorized."

"I entirely agree with you," said the Senator, "and I do not like the implication that Congress is not in complete control of our national policy. That is a standing accusation frequently made against Japan and other countries not committed to the democratic form of government. We can defend democracy best, perhaps, by insisting upon its exercise at home, and by curbing militarism and navalism at the source. . . . What is this senseless agitation about building a navy second to none in the Atlantic, and another one in the Pacific, capable of defending both coasts against hostile attack *simultaneously?* It is fantastic! To build any such navy, or authorize it, under circumstances so obscure, is to yield to hysteria and hallucination. It will certainly be interpreted by others to indicate that we have some ulterior design of sending it on errands of war to the far ends of the oceans. I want the Japanese people, and others, to know that we have no such intention whatever, and that we wish to threaten none, as we expect to remain unthreatened on our own continent and free to work out our democratic destiny and to solve our own problems in our own way."

"It will be of great public service in my judgment," rejoined the Professor, "to make our pacific intention unmistakably clear, in the Pacific as elsewhere, by legislation, before any additional armament is authorized, even in principle. A naval holiday ought to be the acknowledged end-result of economic disarmament and freer trade relations, now sought by the Administration. Let us not leave this matter in any doubt. And there is another aspect of it to which I wish to call your attention. That is the demonstrated profiteering and collusion involved in our naval contracts and construction, as demonstrated by the Nye investigation, two years ago. From the sordid days of the Spanish-American War and the 'bully-beef' outrage to the present hour, commercial mischief and malpractice, lobbying, and charges of collusion have accompanied the expansion of the national defense, particularly in the matter of armor-plate and warship construction. We acquired the Panama Canal Zone and built the Canal ostensibly in order to increase the fighting power of our Atlantic fleet. Now we are told that we must build a gigantic Pacific fleet, and even fortify the Philippines in order to defend the Canal! There is no limit to the fantasies of imperialism!"

"It is true," observed the Senator, "that the Government's record in naval construction is scandalous. I do not think we can afford another Navy!"

"The high-powered lobbyists, the 'fixers' and armament brokers, men of the odious type of William B. Shearer, the undercover agents of the shipbuilding 'ring,' are once again in Washington. Doubtless they are here to sniff the atmosphere of huge contracts and profits, with battleships costing $70,000,000 apiece—as much as our total national annual outlay for education—and no limitation in sight. The evidence adduced by the Senate's munitions investigation was startling; but it did not get to the bottom of the matter, either as to naval policy or as to the personal and commercial relationships between the land-admirals, the contract-letting officials of the Government, and the shipbuilding and munitions corporations. It is a tale full of sound and fury, of international intrigue and propaganda, that signifies much more than we know. It requires fearless exploration and ventilation, now, before it is too late to stop, by exposing what is going on in propaganda, racketeering, and warmongering. It will be a most wholesome thing to have a few more Zaharoff's uncovered, and a few more illusions exploded about this national defense and far-flung naval strategy, before our Federal treasury is emptied for the insatiable lust of the warmakers. Let us have another and more thoroughgoing investigation of navalism and foreign policy."

"I shall be glad to look into the matter very carefully," observed the senior Senator from Idaho. "Many of us are disturbed by it already. I thank you for coming to see me."

"Let us urge," concluded the Professor, rising and extending his honest Yankee hand, "that before our well-matured Congressional policies of with-

drawal from the Philippines and effective, honest arms-embargoes against imperialist belligerents are nullified or undone by the 'collective security' theorists, or by the Executive, the Senate give close attention to the problem of revising and re-stating our pacific, anti-war national policies in unequivocal language. A resolute neutrality and non-intervention in the wars of others, and a faith in the scope and virtues of arbitration have long been the cornerstones of American foreign policy. They are capable of world-wide extension. Let us not desert them now, in panic, but reaffirm and strengthen them courageously. They are the true guaranties of peace."

# The Mastery of Human Fate

GEORGE E. O'DELL

Some of the anthropologists tell us that primitive man, long before he distinguished between soul and body and believed in ghosts, must have been concerned only to recognize power. If he threw a stone and killed an animal for food, he was aware of exercising power. But if the stone merely fell off a cliff and injured him, was not that also an instance of power—in the stone? Thinking with the naïve make-believe of a child, but more self-deceived, he devised ways and means of trying to get power over power, and this was the beginning of magic.

But there were exhibitions of power in Nature so immense and so utterly beyond his control as to fill him with fear and awe, and with shuddering or ecstatic submission to the inevitable, and that, say the anthropologists, was the beginning of religion. Later, perhaps, he gained an experience of selfhood and knew his own conduct as due to inner motives, and that was the beginning of ethics. The religion of submission and the ethics of personal responsibility have since resulted in strange forms of paradox, due to clashing concepts. Men are thought of as predestined before birth to go specifically to heaven or to hell after they shall die, no matter how they behave—yet the predestinarian punishes others and himself in this life for misconduct. To the devout Mohammedan, everything that happens is fated—yet he experiences guilt and remorse when his own motives are involved in the happening. Progress in religion, the making of ethics paramount in it, demands a facing of both elements, and a rational harmonizing of them. Paradox no doubt remains; we can say, yes, there is such a thing as fate, though we may not know its cause,—but we can beat it!

It is not easy to bring home to our immensely active Occidental minds that, given no change in conditions, certain things inevitably continue to happen. Let us illustrate from the realm of vital statistics. We are used to the notion of a birth-rate or a death-rate. But do we ever take note of the extraordinary uniformity, year after year, in the incidence of disease? The reports of the Health Department of New York City, for, say, 1934, 1935 and 1936 may easily astound anyone unused to the facts. Take the deaths from tuberculosis in these consecutive years: 4,420; 4,371; 4,565. Or those from diabetes: 2,266; 2,255; 2,571. Or the deaths in Manhattan from appendicitis: 247, 228, 290. Or the deaths per hundred thousand from pneumonia in New York in these same years: 93, 88, 89. Or from hernia: 10, 10, 10. Or from pernicious anaemia: 1, 1, 1. Of course, I am selecting striking figures, but in the less striking the annual differences amount to little more. And the question an intelligent mind must surely ask is: Why are not any of these figures, for other than epidemic diseases, halved or trebled in any year? Why should it not happen that only a hundred persons die of appendicitis in one year and a thousand in another?

But much more perplexing figures are to come. Let us rise from the physiological plane to one frequently mental. Here is the toll of persons who died because of accidents in New York City in the three years under review: 4,461; 4,257; 4,228. But why not 400 in one year and 40,000 in another? Again, I have not the itemized figures at hand for accidental deaths in New York City; but I have those for Brooklyn for two years when it happened that I lived there:

| | 1st year | 2nd year |
|---|---|---|
| Falling from buildings | 16 | 15 |
| Falling from fire-escapes | 13 | 15 |
| Falling downstairs | 38 | 32 |
| Electric surface cars | 46 | 41 |
| Steam trains | 7 | 7 |
| Burning by lamps | 6 | 6 |
| Illuminating gas | 19 | 20 |
| Opium and morphia | 5 | 5 |
| Playing with matches | 18 | 18 |

If I add that in one of these two years in Manhattan 40 persons were "crushed by elevators" and in the second 41, will you not perhaps look a little uneasily at an elevator the next time you are in one—at least in Manhattan?

Well, so much for accidents, where mind, or lapse of it, so often plays a chief part. Let us now mount to the moral sphere, where, more than anywhere, we assume that there is individuality, freedom of the will. The number of persons dying in New York City because of homicide varies just as little as that of those "accidentally" killed. And when we come to the motives listed—we will quote Commissioner Valentine's figures for 1936 and 1937—it would seem as though fate were even more certain here. Here are some of them: Criminal dispute or revenge: 16, 16. Gambling disputes: 9, 9. Husbands and wives or lovers falling out: 78, 82. Drunken dispute: 10, 14. Or there are the number of persons certified as dying in our city from chronic over-drinking in the three years we studied a few moments ago: 471, 433, 445.

Now, if individuality plays a great part in homicide and alcoholic excess, what about those sad folk who take their own lives? Have you ever known any? Do you not know that every case is utterly a case in itself? Yet here are the New York City figures for our sample three years: 1,239; 1,170; 1,116. But why not a thousand-plus in one year and only a hundred, or as many as ten thousand, in another?

Finally, still dealing with happenings where moral considerations play an obvious part, let us descend to what some moralists would think to be the lowest depths of guilty hell, and let it be revealed that the same deadly monotony applies to the number of children born to unmarried mothers. I will not quote

New York figures here, nor name another great American city where I know that steadily year after year around a thousand such children will be registered. My mind rather goes back to statistical facts which many years ago first forced my astonished attention to the issues here concerned. It was in the Royal Borough of Kensington, in London, where Queen Victoria had been born, and her "humble subject," myself, happened much later to be sitting for three years as a "Labor" representative on the local municipal council. The suicides for those three years, I recall, ran thus: 21, 22, 21; the deaths from tuberculosis in the slum ward which I represented: 66, 66, 62; and the births of illegitimate children: 167, 168, 169.

Such numerical facts have a ruthless appearance. For the moment, with timid people, they may paralyze the will.

But surely, even with timid people, only for the moment. There is a rebound. The antidotal idea springs to the front—the idea that if constancy is shocking, great incalculable variability would be very much more so! If we never knew but that half the population without warning might any day die of diabetes, or drown itself, or enter unsanctified unions, life would cease to have for us even such satisfactory meanings as it does have. Better an awful regularity, seeming to imply some sort of fate (even though it should hit ourself) than an irregularity such as might seem to imply a universe given over to mere whim. Then a second assuaging thought: is it not true that there *are* inconstants—but no less calculable, and the calculability is what matters? More automobiles, more slain children, and more bank robberies; but, more "protected" checks, fewer forgeries; also more toxin-antitoxin, less diphtheria, more reliable vaccines, fewer epidemic deaths. Why not—fewer lying parents, more truth-telling children; more organized recreation, fewer criminal gangsters? This last is actually true in certain regions of New York City. And, indeed, while the number of deaths in automobile accidents to adults may increase, the deaths of children from this cause is steadily going down. The children are being taught greater care. We are beating fate!

In short, on the rebound the free human spirit says: Let us get in and act! There is just so much tuberculosis—then let us find the causes and eliminate them! There is a steady increase in "broken homes"—let us study the problem of breakage and get busy about preventing it! Precisely because evils are calculable, in parity with ascertainable causes, the motto can be one of hope instead of despair. Precisely because moral evils are subject to statistical and correlational survey, we can at least hope to deal with cause after cause, external or within, and reduce them ever nearer towards the vanishing point.

Let me use two illustrations of which I have close knowledge. Not many years ago, although crime was decreasing in England, one factor remained terribly constant—the number of youths and young men who drifted into the jail habit. Before they were twenty-three they would have been in prison four or five times for serious offenses. This class stood year by year at about the same figure. Then it occurred to some enlightened jail warden to borrow an idea from Elmira Reformatory, New York, where it was already, alas, languishing, and develop it for all it was worth. To the assistance of the chaplain, the doctor and the schoolmaster were called in. The "juvenile delinquents" were weighed, measured, tested as to their senses, their electrical sensitivity, their school knowledge. It became patent that these young ruffians, however spry they might be in certain aggressive and defensive reactions, were almost always physically and mentally below the average of those classes in the community from which they came. This was a revelation. Then all concerned got busy. The boys were placed on a more plentiful and appetizing diet. They were put to school—and school was made as interesting to them as it could be, with first-rate teachers and the best available equipment. They were given daily hot and cold baths, and military drill—which, whatever objections may be entered against it, has the merit of greater purposeful interest than mere "physical jerks." They were taught a wide variety of trades. Every effort was made to arouse in them normal social ambitions—at the same time that the power to gratify these was sought to be developed. The indeterminate sentence was applied not to seeing how soon a self-repressive hypocrite could cozen his way out, but to trying that none should get out until in a fit condition to compete with his age-fellows in the labor market. No doubt the system is far from perfect, and it is true that it is handicapped by the unwillingness of judges to make the indeterminate sentence indeterminate enough to give the fullest possible chance for the good work of the doctor and the teacher. But when last I heard anything of the statistics of the matter, something like 80 per cent of these jam-fed, pampered criminals, most of whom previously would have been doomed to a lifetime of delinquency, were showing that they wanted no more jail, and were making good. The problem of the other 20 per cent remained.

Of course, the biological forces which were fitting all such boys for jail to begin with were, and doubtless still are, hardly touched, and since the system was not designed to deal with any until they were apparently well confirmed in evil courses, criminals are still being made—for the system eventually to try to cure. But that problem is probably barer to the eye now in England than it ever could have been before.

Again, for a number of years prior to the war the annual expenditure per head of the population in England on alcoholic drinks remained at a steady figure, although individual total abstinence was known to be rapidly on the increase. What could it mean? A systematic survey revealed startling facts. With the constantly growing employment of women in factories, and the steady increase of foul air and of the "slumminess" of out-of-date homes in old industrial cities, women were drinking in larger numbers, and more per head—groups of young girl millhands would club the money at the week-end to buy a quart of gin, and seek with it to relieve their overwrought nerves and the desperate drabness of their lives. Again, with an accelerating increase in the number of salesmen frequently away from home for protracted periods, another large class of workers was tempted to greater indulgence, even though "treating" as an essential to business deals was on the decline. And there were other such instances. In the meantime, in every community where work was stabilized, old slum property replaced with better homes, parks and public libraries opened, evening schools largely frequented, and life in one or another way becoming saner and more interesting, the local drink consumption was going down with a run.

Not perversity, but social cause and effect were, as ever, prime factors in moral degeneration or betterment.

It is not only, then, that paresis, occurring in dogged ratio to population, and seeming to be incurable, suddenly gets on the hopeful list when a mild induced attack of malaria appears to help banish it. Or that periodical health examinations among insurance holders are shown to increase their prospects of life. But the monotonous incidence of wickedness, in so far as it has social causes, is equally liable to be broken up (as it may also be increased) by social changes. And if by social changes, then by educational changes, changes in the character and incidence of ideals, changes in the viewpoint and activity of religious and ethical institutions. Moral obliquity may be a matter of a wrong bent of the inner will of a man. But this does not for a moment put it outside the pale of statistical study, of biological and sociological investigation, of educational experiment and controlled application of mental and spiritual as well as physical means to the desired moral end. Nothing can help moral hope more than to get rid of the notion of perversity, to recognize cause and effect at work no less in the region of good and bad conduct than in that of physical disease or intellectual ignorance, and to look to understanding, experiment, and organization for the increase of moral health and the rooting out of temptations to do wrong.

# Marxism and Religion

A. STIERNOTTE

Marxism does not seem to find any place for religion. If Marxism should triumph in the world, what would become of religion? Would it totally disappear?

In answering this question, we must first ask what is meant by Marxism. I take it to mean the following:

1. That, according to dialectical materialism, changes in human society are caused by class struggles, that the transfer of economic power from one class to another is the ultimate foundation upon which the whole superstructure of society rests and is changed. In other words, the extension of human welfare, of human brotherhood, is conditioned upon the self-assertion of the working class led on finally by its intense sufferings under capitalism, not because human welfare and brotherhood appeal to disinterested persons and secure their devotion. Devotion to an ideal, of course, exists, but not to the extent of rendering superfluous the class struggle, which in the final analysis is the real pivot of history. This disposes of the claim of religious idealism as being the directive force of history.

2. That matter is the foundation of the universe, and that mind comes out of matter. This statement, however, must be qualified by the very important addition that matter to the dialectical materialist philosophy is not the hard, lifeless stuff of the mechanical materialists. Matter is that which "moves," that is, changes, evolves, assumes higher aspects, higher complexities, entirely new aspects, which cannot be reduced to merely molecular motions. In this instance, John Lewis in his *Introduction to Philosophy* states:

> The simplest type of motion is movement. Life is a more complex form. Thought is the highest form known. To prevent the danger of anyone supposing that this is to reduce thought to molecular motion let us say at once that the whole point of this view is that thought is as different from physical movement as Beethoven is different from a lump of chalk. Matter has different forms of activity. The highest activity of matter, only found in man and the highest apes, is the activity known as thought.

This then disposes of a supernatural or personal God to account for spiritual qualities. These are functions of matter in that complex state of aggregation in which we find it in the human brain. There is no reason for assuming that spiritual qualities exist apart from this complex state of aggregation; in other words there are no spirits, angels, devils, supernatural gods, etc. This is a position which of course many liberal ministers already accept in some form.

This apparently does not leave much room for religion, even liberal religion, or even that highest type of utter devotion to ideals which has been manifested throughout history by the religious leaders. What is the trouble? To my mind it is that we have assumed that devotion to ideals is a driving force of history. Devotion to ideals undoubtedly is one of the finest characteristics of idealistic individuals, but this does not mean that pure devotion to ideals, especially "soul-force," without economic or military compulsion, is the driving force of history. The position seems to be that the great religious leaders have proclaimed high ideals of brotherhood and peace, but it is perhaps expecting too much of them to assume that they knew precisely the complex economic and political changes necessary to bring about a reign of brotherhood and peace.

What are the peculiar features of religious idealism which are still consistent with Marxism? First, that remarkable vision of human nature, in which each individual human being is held to have within himself the germs for further improvement, in which his spiritual qualities will be so enhanced, so delicate and so sensitive to suffering, that there will be no need of police force, tribunals, economic and political compulsions, above all, force. Take, for example, the phrase, "Verily, ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit dwelleth in you." What a remarkable conception of the value of human personality! How it is daily contradicted by our mercenary civilization! And yet that vision of a spiritualized humanity is what seems to be the contribution of the great religious leaders. That is to say, the advance of society by the pure impact of mind upon mind, spirit upon spirit, intelligence upon intelligence! The Marxists hold that the state must first be captured, and then, with the gradual elimination of the remnants of capitalist civilization, Socialism changing into Communism, the state will wither away, and the government of men pass into the administration of things.

What the great religious leaders give is a vision of a glorified humanity, but not the slightest method of achieving it. That, I take it, is given by Marxism. Is religion rendered worthless by this sweeping statement? I think not, if by religion we do not mean organized religion which in many cases is linked up with the dominant economic group. Religion has to do with the highest aspirations of the human spirit, with the highest workings of the mind, for even the dialectical materialists insist that thought is a movement of matter far

above molecular motion. This spiritual appreciation is not a driving force of history, but it is a precious quality of the individual human spirit which will be rendered more and more precious through advance to a Communist civilization. Is musical appreciation a driving force of history? No! Neither is the appreciation of beauty, nor that satisfaction of the mind which the great scientist feels when he searches for truth. Yet we all agree that these activities of the mind are of the highest value. So, in spite of all my adherence to Communist philosophy, I still have a high regard for that vision of man as a spiritual entity more precious than anything of which we know. I have often looked upon some charming young lady as the highest synthesis of the dialectical processes of nature. . . .

Another aspect of religious feeling which is not invalidated by Communist philosophy is that mystical feeling of oneness with the universe which all great religious mystics have felt. The temporal in the eternal and the eternal in the temporal! Of course, the mystics express this in the language of theism. But we can take out the idea of God and keep that feeling of union with all existence in which the trials of daily life disappear, in which life becomes exceedingly intense and supremely joyful, in which the whole of life is caught up with the whole universe in an indissoluble unity. This would seem to be the underlying meaning of mystical experience. It seems to be far removed from dialectical materialism, but I think not. And for this reason: dialectical materialism states that the whole universe is in a process of change, of quantity into quality, of transitions (or revolutions) to higher syntheses, etc. The point is that man himself is a movement of matter, and so is spiritual appreciation, as explained above. Hence we see here a connection between the material movements in the universe and the material movements in the human mind, different to be sure, but nevertheless rigorously connected in that mind has come out of matter. Suppose a Communist reflects intellectually on the relationship between the universe with its dialectical movements and human society with its class struggles, and its tremendous import for the whole of civilization and the heightening of human values. Now suppose that the Communist transfigures this intellectual reaction into an emotional one. Suppose he feels the whole sweep of human history as "the planet come to consciousness," as our Humanist friends rightly say. Is not this a naturalistic mystical experience? It is not a driving force of history, but that does not mean it is worthless. The human spirit is more complex than we imagine, and many of the psychological reactions now associated with decaying organized religion will survive in a Communist civilization, in other forms, to be sure, and perhaps on much higher levels.

Religion loses its intrinsic genius when kept on a purely human level. It must have a cosmic dimension. This is not theism, for theism implies a reaction of the universe towards men. I am speaking of a reaction of man towards the universe, which is a totally different thing. It is certainly a daring thing for man to feel so intensely his own spirituality that he will not rest content until he has caught up the whole universe in it, until he feels that the totality of life, all its strivings, sufferings, aspirations, and achievements, have a cosmic meaning. When man realizes this, in some sublime emotional moment, he has a religious experience *par excellence*.

It is interesting to note that, in tackling a scientific problem, our mind reacts intellectually; in taking part in sports, we react physically; in admiring beauty, our mind functions emotionally. But what is that function of the mind which is integrated and unified, and reacts as a totality to the highest in life? This is what I would call the spiritual function. And what is that function of the mind in which the whole of life is related emotionally to the whole of the universe? I would call this the mystical function of the mind. Religion is made up of these two aspects, a human and a cosmic relation. The human aspect necessarily implies a set of ethical values which demands action. The nature of the action is not given by religion. Why think it strange that it may be given by Marxism-Leninism? In other words, religion is an emotional reaction to humanity and to the universe, but not a system of economics or sociology. But religious people are not absolved from studying and devoting themselves to whatever movements advance human welfare. The highest welfare would be the development of humanity to such a degree that the emotional reactions mentioned above would be the possession of every human being, so that we could say, figuratively speaking, "the Spirit dwelleth in you."

Thus is it possible to be an intense Marxist and an intense religionist. Lenin himself had a strong sense of the spiritual degradation engendered by capitalism, for he stated:

> This economic oppression of the workers inevitably causes and breeds all forms of political oppression and social degradation; it renders the spiritual and moral life of the masses coarser and more sordid.

If Marxism triumphs in the world, we shall still have left of religion a vision of a spiritualized humanity and a naturalistic mysticism towards the universe. Some radicals in the United Church of Canada have recently published a very challenging book, *Towards the Christian Revolution,* which shows a very good approach to Marxism, and which has won the high acclaim of John Strachey, perhaps the most intelligent Communist of the present day. This is a textbook of the coming religion of Marxist Christianity.

---

### The Jobless

I feel the despair of the jobless;
I feel the ache of their misery!
This waiting and hoping and longing,
This seeking fulfillment in work,
This pain from the void of drifting!
Thrust out of the shops and the factories,
Trudging the streets and the byways,
Weighed by their hopeless dependents,
Wanting the pride of man's work,
Wanting employment of muscle and brain,
Wanting a purpose for being,
Yet drifting and drifting, cracking, till crushed!

I feel the doubt that assails them,
The fearful doubt of themselves.
I rage at the smug who scorn them,
These masters of privilege and power,
Greedy and ugly with wealth,
Scheming their wars to defend it,
Piling up misery to hide it,
Daring to trample man's dreams!

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

# The Study Table

## A New Proclamation of the Christian Gospel

Publications of Willett, Clark & Company, Chicago

THE CHURCH AND ITS FUNCTION. *By W. A. Visser 't Hooft and J. H. Oldham.* $2.00.

THE CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF MAN. *By T. E. Jessup, Robert L. Calhoun, and others.* $2.00.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND HISTORY. *By H. G. Wood, C. H. Dodd, and others.* $2.00.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND COMMON LIFE. *By Nils Ehrenstrom, Martin Dibellius, and others.* $2.00.

CHURCH AND COMMUNITY. *By K. S. Latourette, Ernest Barker, and others.* $2.00.

CHURCH, COMMUNITY AND STATE IN RELATION TO EDUCATION. *By Fred Clarke, W. Zenkovsky, and others.* $2.00.

THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH AND THE WORLD OF NATIONS. *By the Marquess of Lothian, Sir Alfred Zimmern, and others.* $2.00.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE: OFFICIAL REPORT. *Edited by J. H. Oldham.* $2.00.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND THE MODERN STATE. *By Nils Ehrenstrom.* $1.50.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE EASTERN CONFLICTS. *By William Paton.* $1.50.

WORLD CHAOS OR WORLD CHRISTIANITY. *By Henry Smith Leiper.* $1.50.

[The Eleven Volumes, complete—$14.00]

This is not a review but just a notice of one of the most important and praiseworthy publishing undertakings of our time. What we have in these volumes is a record, or rather deposit, of the best Christian thinking of our time on the problems most direfully besetting our troubled world. The books center about, as they were occasioned by, the great World Christian Conference on Church, Community, and State which met in Oxford, England, in the summer of 1937, and are thus fittingly grouped together as the Oxford Conference Library. One of the eleven volumes is a record of the Conference itself, with a full text of its official findings and its message to the Churches. The other ten volumes represent papers, addresses, studies prepared by fifty of the most distinguished scholars of the Christian world, chosen three years before the Conference met, in anticipation of the gathering of the great assembly. After the close of the Conference, the manuscripts were returned to the authors for revision in the light of the Conference discussions, and are now published in enduring form as a veritable Christian manifesto to the modern age.

We know of nothing just like this ever done before. We think the publishers are justified in calling their undertaking "a landmark in the history of Christian thought." To all churchmen, cleric and laic alike, and to the great body of the intelligent public, these books are of prime importance. They prove anew what may have been forgotten—that the church is a major influence in the life of our time.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

## Interpreting the Orient

The present Sino-Japanese conflict has aroused intense interest in China, which is struggling for her national existence. If this interest is to be something more than sentimental curiosity, one should understand the forces that sustain the Chinese people. Where is the source of vitality of the Chinese, which has enabled them to survive, in spite of many external assaults and periodical internal chaos caused by civil wars? It is not in military power, nor in material grandeur, but in a philosophy of life, which has moulded the individual as well as the national outlook of the Chinese.

Lin Yutang, in his new work *The Importance of Living*[1] has given us not only a brilliant exposition of Chinese philosophy as practised in the daily life of the people, but a comparative study of Chinese and western civilizations, without pedantic scholarship.

In this era when the State is being held up as the supreme object of worship and as absolute authority, Mr. Lin's book will be a corrective. Mr. Lin holds that if our common heritage of civilization is to be saved, there must be greater stress on the development of less selfish individual lives, based upon rational and humanized thinking, and the exercise of common sense in the intercourse between states as well as individuals. The author decries all forms of extremism such as Communism and Fascism.

During the first decade of the twentieth century, when Japan was fighting Russian expansion in the Far East and checking German Imperialism, and thus aiding the political and economic programs of the Anglo-Saxon Powers—Great Britain and the United States—we heard much praise of the Japanese people and their leaders from the pens of American and British writers. Nowadays in America we rarely hear of Bushido, the spirit of the Samurai, and characterization of the Japanese as the Anglo-Saxons of the East. The present Sino-Japanese War has created an adverse atmosphere against the Japanese people. We are pleased to note that *Children of the Rising Sun*[2] is not a biased, anti-Japanese book. It is not a profound study of modern Japan in her economic and political transformations; but it gives us a popular, useful, clear and concise version of what the Japanese people are, and why they are so. In this work are discussed in good journalistic style Japan's internal economy, pressure of population, search for raw materials and markets, as the result of her industrialization, her fear of isolation in world politics, her expansion on the Asiatic continent, her attitude towards China, Korea, Manchuria, the Philippines, Siam, the British Empire, Soviet Russia, and other great Powers.

The Japanese people, like all other peoples, have their hopes and fears; and the present aspect of Japanese expansion is not very different in spirit from that of British expansion in India, or the "manifest destiny" of the United States, or Russian expansion on the continent of Asia. Japan has proved herself to be a very apt pupil of the Western Powers. But the

---

[1] THE IMPORTANCE OF LIVING. *By Lin Yutang.* 459 *pp. New York: John Day & Company.* $3.00.

[2] CHILDREN OF THE RISING SUN. *By Willard Price.* 315 *pp. New York: John Day & Company.* $3.00.

author thinks that, under new conditions, Japan may be an important factor in the new social order.

Japanese expansion on the Asiatic continent[3] is receiving considerable interest among American scholars of international relations. It is most gratifying that the Northeastern Asia Seminar of the University of California, under the leadership of Professor Robert J. Kerner, has undertaken to make a thorough study of this vital question. Prof. Yoshi S. Kuno, a Japanese scholar, sometime Chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages in the University of California, has given us the first of a series of three volumes on the subject. This is a scholarly essay on Japanese history from the earliest time to the founding of the Tokugawa Shogunate under the military leadership of Iyeyasu, with special emphasis on Japanese expansion on the Asiatic continent. The work is based upon original Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and other documents. The value of the book is considerably enhanced by the incorporation of the English translation of forty-one documents covering one hundred and fifty pages, with notes, index, and bibliography. Thus the work may be classed as a unique reference book on the subject.

While discussing Japan's relations with her Asiatic neighbors, Korea and China, the author has supplied us with information regarding internal conditions as well as the foreign policy of China and Korea in respect to themselves and towards Japan.

At the very outset let us recognize the fact that the condition of eastern Asia a few centuries before and after the Christian era was fundamentally the same as in other parts of the world. Vast and periodic migrations of peoples from one region to another caused wars, subjection of the original inhabitants of a country, the intermixture of peoples, and the development of a new people with small independent states with a suzerain power over them. In fact, the Japanese people were the invaders of the islands now known as Japan; the Chinese and the Korean peoples were invaded by Huns, Tartars, Mongols, and others. In all cases, internal weakness caused by civil wars helped the foreign invaders to subjugate the peoples. Japan can be proud of the record that her island shores have never been conquered by any other power; while China and Korea have repeatedly been victims of foreign aggressions.

During the period of the early fifth century to the beginning of the seventeenth century, Japan made repeated attacks on Korean independence. However, China also was in no way backward in extending her sway over Korea through conquest. From the study of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean records, one comes to the conclusion that "either in the latter part of the fourth or in the early part of the fifth century, Japan established her suzerainty over Shinra and Kudara, extended her military sway over Korei, and finally established her government-general in Mimana for the purpose of supervising affairs in the Korean peninsula."

One may be tempted to assert that the present-day preponderance of militarist influence in the Japanese government has its foundation in the national tradition —the spirit of Japanese fuedalism. Today Japan is one of the great industrial and capitalist countries of the world; and as such, in the field of Japanese imperialist expansion, her activities are directed by a capitalist-military oligarchy. This is also a fact in all imperialist lands of today.

During the thirteenth century, the spirit of Chinese militarism and imperialism was not different from that of other eastern or western nations of that era. China, under the Mongols, not only ruled over Korea, but Kubla Khan made several unsuccessful attempts during a period of thirty-three years (1266-1299) to conquer Japan. Professor Kuno speaks of periodic chaos in China, but he has graphically described the period of the 150-years' Civil War in Japan—the Dark Age of Japan—which was followed by a new era of Japanese transformation under military rulers. It is not very different from the revival of Europe after its Dark Age.

During the latter part of the sixteenth century, after the national unification of Japan, Hideyoshi planned for the establishment of an Asiatic empire extending from Korea to India, and fought against Korea and China. After the Seven Years' War Japan had to drop this program of expansion, because Hideyoshi died and there were internal difficulties which made it impossible for Japan to pursue her ambitious scheme. One must not be horrified with the thought of Japanese expansion of the sixteenth century; but should try to see in it the same historical phenomenon as in the case of the expansion of Europe. The only difference between these two adventures is that the Japanese program failed while European world conquest and domination is still progressing, although it is checked to a certain extent in the Far East, by the rise of the recent Japanese imperial might and aggressive force.

Professor Kuno thinks that Hideyoshi's exploits of the sixteenth century still serve as sources of inspiration to the young Japanese, who favor the conquest of Korea and China.

Professor Kuno is by no means a protagonist of Japanese expansion in Asia. As a historian he has stated facts that have great significance in studying the Japanese program of expansion today. One may further ask the question: Is it possible that the famous Tanaka Memorial and Japan's positive policy in China have been influenced by the program of Hideyoshi?

Japan's ability in assimilating western civilization has been regarded as a strange phenomenon; but it has its past parallel. Just as the Western Powers during the Crusades came in contact with the superior civilization of the Arabs and thus became benefitted culturally and industrially, similarly Japan during her Seven Years' War learned a great deal from Korea.

Western scholars of the Orient will be benefitted by Professor Kuno's book. The work, however, would have been more valuable and effective if the author had made comparisons with the expansionist programs of other nations. Japan is not the only Power which has cherished expansionist dreams and waged wars to make them real.

TARAKNATH DAS

---

Men come to be builders, by building; harp players, by playing on the harp; exactly so, by doing just actions we come to be just; by doing the actions of temperance we come to be temperate; and by doing brave actions, brave.

*—Aristotle.*

[3] JAPANESE EXPANSION ON THE ASIATIC CONTINENT. *Vol. I. By Yoshi S. Kuno. 373 pp. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.* $4.00.

# Correspondence

### The Marcus Graham Case

I

Editor of UNITY:

In regard to the write-up of the Marcus Graham case in UNITY of April 30, we wish to appeal to all individuals and organizations who are filing protests with the Secretary of Labor to kindly forward us copies of same. Our Committee is also planning a series of protest meetings this coming fall in various parts of the country and would welcome the coöperation of individuals and organizations willing to aid.

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE.

*P. O. Box* 971,
*Los Angeles, California.*

II

Editor of UNITY:

My attention has been called to the fact that in your issue of April 30, 1938, you have spoken about the Marcus Graham case. A deliberate attempt has been made to twist the Graham case, which involves merely the right of a sovereign nation to determine who shall be within its borders and the right to compel an alien to give information concerning his right to be within the United States, into a free speech question.

If you will read the opinion filed by me, which is reported at 22 Federal Supplement 149, and which you may obtain at a law library, you will see that a sentence of contempt was imposed on Graham not because he was and is an avowed anarchist, but because he, an alien, declined to answer questions concerning his right to be in the United States. This was in violation of a law which gives immigration authorities the power to demand such answers, and gives federal judges the right to compel such answers, and punish disobedience by contempt. The law which denies anarchists the right to enter the United States was enacted by the Congress, *not by me*. The Supreme Court has held it constitutional.

I would appreciate your giving publicity to this letter so that the other side of the shield may also be shown.

LEON R. YANKWICH,
*U. S. District Judge.*

*Los Angeles, California.*

---

### Evolution and Henry Ward Beecher

Editor of UNITY:

May I contribute an observation that I do not wish you to construe as a criticism? In the issue of UNITY February 7, 1938, on page 169 I read:

> The religious implications of the evolution theory were emphasized as early as the eighties by Henry Ward Beecher . . .

Would it not be well for UNITY at least to do what it can to demolish the idea that Henry Ward Beecher was a pioneer in espousing the Darwin theory of evolution and reconciling it with religion? You must recall Chadwick's sermons along this line in the seventies, and if you will look up in the *Dictionary of American Biography* my article on Newton Mann you will see how long before Beecher he had come out for evolution. In the life of E. W. Youmans it is very plainly stated that Beecher was a time-server in this matter, but once the pioneers had blazed the trail he talked very loud and claimed a lot of credit for coöperation he never gave when it was most needed.

CHARLES LYTTLE.

*The Meadville Theological School,*
*Chicago, Illinois.*

---

### Women in the War Parade

Editor of UNITY:

There is no man but was born of woman, and it is a sad omission not to give women a prominent place in the War Parade mentioned in UNITY of May 2.

To that of the New York *Post* I should add a horde of mothers, young and old, with as many and more healthy, laughing babies, and skipping girls and boys, containing potentialities for leadership—artists, scientists, teachers—each placarded with a vivid sign. "Cannon Fodder—Born To Be Blown to Bits!"

Who knows but what some of the leaders we need so desperately now are rotting in Flanders Fields?

Congratulations on your splendid magazine.

V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK.

*Roann, Indiana.*

### The Darrow Number

I

Editor of UNITY:

What a great number your Darrow number is! So discriminating, so great in having opponents give their testimony! If we had your spirit we could discuss anything, be as wide as the poles apart and yet agree on essentials. Never in my seventy-seven years has anything illuminated the heavens as this number. This may be extravagant praise yet such is the feeling left.

MORRIS LYCHENHEIM.

*Chicago, Illinois.*

II

Editor of UNITY:

Just finished reading UNITY! Darrow was a saint. But few have the discerning eye you have to discern the great ones —Gandhi, et al.

SYDNEY STRONG.

*Seattle, Washington.*

---

### Fifth Avenue Poster Walk Attracts Thousands

Editor of UNITY:

We feel that all of your Pacifist readers who want to put on a vivid and novel type of war resistance or disarmament propaganda will be interested in the fact that here in New York, on a negligible budget, there was put on the excellent demonstration described on the attached sheet.

Even this is by no means the whole story, for, as usual with press-releases, it was written up before we marched.

The large crowds on Fifth Avenue, the intense interest from the taxis and the motor buses, together with the press notices which carried the fact of our march to many thousands,—all this seemed to demonstrate the advisability of many communities following suit.

Won't you help us bring this to their attention?

The story in the New York *Times*, after describing the demonstration says:

> The demonstration was received with quiet interest by thousands of persons along the avenue. A few called the walk "silly," but others discussed armament, the question of whether to sell helium to Germany, and similar subjects. One elderly man patted a marcher on the back and said: "Good! Good for you, but don't worry—we're not going to have any more war." A taxicab driver, watching the procession, declared: "At last the people are getting the right idea. Why should young fellows go to school and go to college and then go to war and get killed?"

A. J. MUSTE.

*New York City.*

[Enclosure]

Protesting against all war propaganda, including the recent blackout proceedings on Long Island, representatives of the United Pacifist Committee (242 East 14th Street, N. Y.), of which the Reverend A. J. Muste is chairman, carried pungent pacifist posters up and down Fifth Avenue.

Five-score men and women from the various groups represented on the United Pacifist Committee, swung west from Caravan Hall, rounding the corner of 59th Street at Fifth Avenue, with a vivid spot of color reflected from the flaring green lettering of their peace placards. Among the slogans, repeated at frequent intervals in the "Poster Walk," were the following:

UNITE AGAINST ALL WARS
RESIST ALL WAR
DOWN WITH TARIFF WALLS
ALL MEN ARE BROTHERS
WAR MEANS FASCISM
JOBS—NOT BATTLESHIPS
ARMAMENT IS PROVOCATION—NOT DEFENSE
JOBS—NOT WAR
STOP SHIPPING SCRAP-IRON
KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR
CIVIL LIBERTY AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE
ECONOMIC COOPERATION—NOT WAR
DEMOCRATIC WORLD GOVERNMENT NOW
THOU SHALT NOT KILL
TODAY BLACKOUTS — TOMORROW BLACK PLAGUE OF WAR

A. J. Muste, Director of Labor Temple, New York, and Chairman of Saturday's walk, said:

We are all through with all war. We are not frightened by all the bogey-men of Europe and Asia. But we are frightened by the increasing militarization of the United States, and we demand disarmament now. We have no battleships or airplanes, no billion-dollar fund with which to dramatize our viewpoint. So we go on foot, like the pilgrims of old.

Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan, founder of the War Resisters League, publicist and author of "International Government," commented:

Our aim in the "Poster Walk" is to register our protest against all war, international and civil, and to make vivid our faith in better ways to overcome Fascism and build a sane world-order.

Rev. Eliot White, A. J. Muste, Mirza Ahmad Sohrab, Rev. Harold E. Fey, Eva Ingersoll Wakefield, David L. Clendenin of the Workers' Defense League, Mary MacDowell, Tracy D. Mygatt, Anna Curtis, Laurence Hosie, Elizabeth Sherman, Edward P. Gottlieb, Frances Witherspoon, Helen Gainsborough, Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan and Joseph Zarella, of the Catholic Worker, were among the marchers.

## The Field

(*Continued from page* 114)

and to that host of others who have braved the perils of ordinary labor that you and I might live. . . .

Certainly the practice of the arts of peace evokes just as high drama, intrepid courage, and unselfish devotion as do human warfare and bloodshed.

A Pasteur, working quietly in his laboratory, did more to change the course of the world than a Napoleon charging forward on myriad battle fronts.

A Marconi, by the wizardry of his intellect penetrating the mists of the mountain tops and the depths of the sea with a wave of electrical energy, has rendered a higher service and a more lasting contribution to mankind than the Caesars, ancient and modern, who attempted to remake the map of the world by brute force.

A Father Damien, ministering to the simple wants of the untouchable lepers on an isolated, tropical island, braved a peril just as deadly as machine-gun fire; and far more important, his work was one of social reconstruction, not destruction.

How fleeting are the triumphs and glories of war and how enduring is the handiwork of peace! The boundaries set by one war are erased in the next; the ideals for which men bleed and die are soon forgotten and trampled into the dust. But the inventions and pursuits of peace continue to pour forth their benefits in an unending stream centuries later.

On this Memorial Day we rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of the high ideals and noble aspirations which animated the lives and inspired the bravery of our soldier-dead. But we utter a fervent prayer that this goal will be achieved in the paths of peace and not by human carnage.

And we can never hope to pay adequate tribute to our heroes of peace; they have carved their names in the enduring marble of human achievement. And the inscription over their names reads: "We have died in order that you might live."

### Unity

By ROMAIN ROLLAND

A noble call for the union of French intellectuals has just been issued by thirteen writers belonging to different parties. I add my voice to theirs.

Oh, my colleagues of French thought—writers, artists, men of science—allow one of your elders to make his confession, and yours, at this grave hour for France!

All of us have labored as best we could; and no country can be prouder than ours of the great work and the genius of her children. Steadily and without relaxing we continue the line of the good workers in the intellectual field who have been serving and honoring the French community for centuries. But too often we also continue their dissensions and conflicts.

In untroubled times it is healthy for all the debates of the mind to develop to the full: they widen the field of exploration of art and science; they provoke an abundance of experience and of contradictory and complementary discoveries. Even the passions overexcited by these intellectual jousts are the ransom of these conquests, which become the property of all.

But at times when common property is threatened quarrels must cease, divisions must be wiped out at once, and from all the nation's parties hands must be extended to meet together. Let the union be sealed!

At no time has this imposed itself with such imperious necessity as at the present, when not only the fate of a nation is at stake, but the sacred values of civilization—all the culture of the world, menaced in its most precious conquests of the last few centuries, in its heroic efforts for progress, in its dignity, in its liberty. What none of us had foreseen thirty years ago is here: the civilization of the West sees the barbarians issuing from its own loins; it sees rising against it madmen, such as this gang-leader who hurled into the dying face of Unamuno, "Death to intelligence!" A fierce wind of a new Islam has risen against the most civilized older nations; fanatic prophets, bearing a Koran for war against the "infidels," are launching blind and devouring hordes, with their fleets of black planes, upon the world.

This savage inundation, which has already overrun the frontiers, which has just engulfed old Austria, which is covering a part of Spain, piling up at the gates of Czechoslovakia, and flinging its menacing defi to all the democracies of the world, is encircling France from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, from the Vosges to the Alps and the Pyrenees. In the eyes of the world, France has the doubtful honor of having become the last Continental citadel of liberty—of liberty in all its most vital forms, most essential to any human society, any progress: political and social liberty, intellectual liberty, even religious liberty—since at the present time the barbarian tide threatens to carry away, together with freedom of the mind and the ideal of social justice, of mutual respect, and of the equality of men and of races, the religions that claim the two and three-thousand-year-old heritage of the Gospel and the Bible.

All the Old World, and all the New, witness this brutal assault rising against them. And when one thinks of the tremendous material and moral forces which they represent, their debility makes one blush. Their weakness indicts their disunion. Their disunion makes for the arrogance and the might of the adversary. If their alliance were sealed, the invasions would be shattered upon it, as the Arabs were at Poitiers.

Let us achieve unity! My associates of all the branches of intellectual activity, let us give the example, let us realize it! Let us declare a truce to all our discords! All of us desire fruitful peace, the peace of the world, peace for all in labor, and equal justice for all. But in our time—at all times—peace is given only to those who have the courage to want it and to defend it. Our old Victor Hugo said, "Let us declare peace for the world!" We can do it only by being united and strong.

*The New Masses.*

### How to Make Peace

The Friends Peace Committee of London recently issued a pamphlet, *Peace-Making in Africa,* by Kathleen E. Innis, showing how peace was reëstablished in an African tribal war. The incident has importance for the entire world.

Word came from Liberia to the League of Nations that the Krus, a native tribe, were at war. The quarrel was about land boundaries; and in the resulting fighting, 44 native villages were burnt, 12,000 people had been driven out of their homes, fishing was interrupted by hostile raids, farming was disrupted by insecurity, and famine threatened. To make things worse, modern guns had been acquired by some of the Krus, and they terrorized the countryside with these.

The League appointed one man, Dr. Mackenzie, to go to Liberia and try to make peace. Dr. Mackenzie at once went to the heart of the trouble. "It was clear," he said, "that there never could be peace whilst the country was virtually an armed camp. The deprivation of arms is in itself a great incentive to peace—the sight of a gun tempts to war." Accordingly he persuaded the warring tribes to give up their guns and rifles, 500 of them; and he promised that the land boundary problem would be permanently settled.

Within two months all fighting stopped, and in the following negotiations all points of friction were removed and peace was restored. How did this happen? A friendly "outsider" offered his good services; he persuaded the enemies to disarm; he searched out the causes of the dispute and remedied them. Can "civilized" nations follow this simple formula which worked so well in Africa?

*Nofrontier News Service.*